

What information is contained in this annex?

Information contained within this annex is personal data extracted from records held by the Department for Business and Trade (DBT) about you.

Extracts of Personal Data:

Item 1: 3 Attachments found within email titled Chapple Response
Sent on: 05/11/2024 13:30

a)

Office for Product Safety and Standards

Cannon House
18 The Priory Queensway
Birmingham
B4 6BS



Office for Product
Safety & Standards

General enquiries: +44 (0)121 345 1201

Sent via email to sparkelectrical.sw@gmail.com

23 October 2024

**Reference: Formal Complaint on Regulatory Handling Failures and Conflicts of Interest Involving
OPSS|CRM:0315000000476**

Dear Mr Chapple,

Thank you for your email dated 9th October.

The Office for Product Safety and Standards (OPSS) are a Department with Business and Trade (DBT). We understand that you have written to DBT outlining your concerns, these are being reviewed by the relevant teams and a response will follow in due course.

From our records, we can see that the DBT correspondence team contacted you on 4 October to advise that a response should be sent to you by the end of this month, no further correspondence will be sent to you by OPSS in respect of the matter.

Kind regards
OPSS

(b) DBT Complaint Response - ref CMPT22024/10570



Department for Business & Trade

Department for Business and Trade
Old Admiralty Building
London
SW1A 2DY

Conor Chapple
sparkelectrical.sw@gmail.com

T +44 (0)20 7215 5000
E Complaints@businessandtrade.gov.uk
W www.gov.uk/dit

CMPT12024/10570

:

12th November 2024

Dear Conor Chapple,

Thank you for your email of 30th October where you raised the following complaint:

I would also like to clarify whether this is the final stage of the formal complaint process with DBT. If so, please confirm so that I can escalate my concerns to the appropriate oversight bodies that scrutinise regulatory and public service bodies, such as the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman (PHSO) or other relevant authorities responsible for ensuring proper handling of complaints.

We can confirm that we have reviewed the emails in relation to UKAS and OPSS. The complaints process can only be used in relation to a service provided by the Department of Business and Trade (DBT) and our staff. UKAS operates independently of the Department for Business and Trade and the Government.

Consequently, we are unable to provide guidance on their complaints process and procedures as this is handled independently. We recommend that you follow any advice from UKAS to appeal their decisions.

On 30th October 2024, the correspondence team informed you that the relevant team within the Department (OPSS) had completed a review of your concerns and reached a conclusion on your case.

your case.

I am satisfied with the responses provided to you as your concerns do not relate to a service provided by the Department, which includes the Office for Product Safety and Standards.

If you are still not satisfied, you can ask your local MP to refer the matters that you have raised to the Ombudsman Services.

You can get more advice from the ombudsman's office by contacting:

Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman
Milbank Tower

30 Milbank
London
SW1P 4QP
Telephone: 0345 015 4033
Fax: 0300 061 4000

See:- <https://www.ombudsman.org.uk/>

Kind regards,

Complaints
Department for Business and Trade | Old Admiralty Building | London | SW1A 2DY
|E-mail: complaints@businessandtrade.gov.uk

c)

From: Spark Electrical Services <sparkelectrical.sw@gmail.com>

Sent on: 30 October 2024 11:13

Subject: UKAS NAPIT and EA to UKAS and NAPIT, Dare I ask? | Re: Department for Business and Trade Response - TOB2024/08816

I would also like to clarify whether this is the final stage of the formal complaint process with DBT. If so, please confirm so that I can escalate my concerns to the appropriate oversight bodies that scrutinise regulatory and public service bodies, such as the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman (PHSO) or other relevant authorities responsible for ensuring proper handling of complaints.

Many Thanks

Conor Chapple
Spark Electrical Services

From:[Redacted]

Sent on: 30 October 2024 11:54

Subject: UKAS NAPIT and EA to UKAS and NAPIT, Dare I ask? | Re: Department for Business and Trade Response - TOB2024/08816

Hi [Redacted],

Is there anything we need to do with the below request from the correspondent? Please see the attached response we issued and advice from officials below.

Please note: This correspondent has been classed vexatious complainant by UKAS and has been issued a 'cease and desist' letter by NAPIT's lawyers. Going forward it would be helpful if DBT correspondence unit can classify him as a persistent correspondent as the policy team have closed the case and do not intend to respond to any further queries.

Many thanks,
[Redacted]

From:[Redacted]

Sent on: 30 October 2024 14:49

Subject: UKAS NAPIT and EA to UKAS and NAPIT, Dare I ask? | Re: Department for Business and Trade Response - TOB2024/08816

Dear colleagues,

Please attached correspondence and the below message from policy leads on how we should proceed with this correspondent going forward. Mr Chapple is now classed as vexatious, with policy leads indicating they will take no additional actions. He is now requesting details on follow up procedures surrounding complaints.

Are you able to take forward as appropriate from your side please?

Many thanks,
[Redacted]

From:[Redacted]

Sent on: 04 November 2024 11:46

Subject: UKAS NAPIT and EA to UKAS and NAPIT, Dare I ask? | Re: Department for Business and Trade Response - TOB2024/08816

Mr Chappell has now gone down the DBT complaints route. Below is the SP folder with all his correspondence that has been received and our latest letter to him. In my last email to the correspondence team. I did put

Annex A – Extract of Personal Data for Subject Access Request [KIM 2024-25-37-CC]

down that the writer had been classed as a vexatious complainant by UKAS and had been issued a 'cease and desist' letter by NAPIT's lawyers.

(Redacted)

The complaints team have given two options, see email below:

Can I leave it to you to respond to (Redacted) on this please as I think she has been assigned to deal with the case.

Many thanks

(Redacted)

From: [Redacted]

Sent on: 04 November 2024 18:50

Subject: UKAS NAPIT and EA to UKAS and NAPIT, Dare I ask? | Re: Department for Business and Trade Response - TOB2024/08816

Hi (Redacted),

I'm contacting you regarding handling TOB2024/08816 and its predecessor TOB2024/07947 which was a complaint about UKAS. For background this correspondence was addressed to (Redacted) in August 2024 and went round several teams before it was decided it should be handled by (Redacted) as Treat as Official Business as we oversee the relationship with UKAS.

We have reviewed all the documents provided to us and concluded that there is no evidence for the various complaints that were being made. Looking at the latest response from the correspondent, my understanding is that he wishes to escalate this above the department as he is asking if this is the final stage of the complaints procedure in DBT. I understand that the correspondence has not followed the complaints procedure but the outcome of the review of the information would not change regardless of the procedure used.

The correspondent has also complained about how OPSS Enquiries has responded to his enquiry regarding conflict of interest in UKAS and OPSS. This was sent separately to the DBT correspondence. (Redacted)

Thanks

(Redacted)

From: [Redacted]

Sent on: 05 November 2024 13:40

Subject: UKAS NAPIT and EA to UKAS and NAPIT, Dare I ask? | Re: Department for Business and Trade Response - TOB2024/08816

Hi all,

Please see draft response from complaints, please do amend as needed

[20241105 DBT Complaint Draft 10570.docx](#)

(Redacted)

Many thanks,

Copy of DBT Complaint Draft

 Department for Business & Trade	Department for Business and Trade Old Admiralty Building London SW1A 2DY
Conor Chapple sparkedelectrical.sw@gmail.com	T +44 (0)20 7215 5000 E Complaints@businessandtrade.gov.uk W www.gov.uk/dit
	CMPT12024/10570 : 12 th November 2024

Dear Conor Chapple,

Thank you for your email of 30th October where you raised the following complaint:

I would also like to clarify whether this is the final stage of the formal complaint process with DBT. If so, please confirm so that I can escalate my concerns to the appropriate oversight bodies that scrutinise regulatory and public service bodies, such as the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman (PHSO) or other relevant authorities responsible for ensuring proper handling of complaints.

We can confirm that we have reviewed the emails in relation to UKAS and OPSS. The complaints process can only be used in relation to a service provided by the Department of Business and Trade (DBT) and our staff. UKAS operates independently of the Department for Business and Trade and the Government.

Consequently, we are unable to provide guidance on their complaints process and procedures as this is handled independently. We recommend that you follow any advice from UKAS to appeal their decisions.

On 30th October 2024, the correspondence team informed you that the relevant team within the Department (OPSS) had completed a review of your concerns and reached a conclusion on your case.

I am satisfied with the responses provided to you as your concerns do not relate to a service provided by the Department, which includes the Office for Product Safety and Standards.

If you are still not satisfied, you can ask your local MP to refer the matters that you have raised to the Ombudsman Services.

You can get more advice from the ombudsman's office by contacting:

Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman
Milbank Tower
30 Milbank
London
SW1P 4QP
Telephone: 0345 015 4033
Fax: 0300 061 4000

See:- <https://www.ombudsman.org.uk/>

Kind regards,

Complaints

Department for Business and Trade | Old Admiralty Building | London | SW1A 2DY
[E-mail:complaints@businessandtrade.gov.uk](mailto:complaints@businessandtrade.gov.uk)

From:[Redacted]

Sent on: Wed 06/11/2024 12:30

Subject: UKAS NAPIT and EA to UKAS and NAPIT, Dare I ask? | Re: Department for Business and Trade Response - TOB2024/08816

(Redacted)

I have made my very slight amends and added comments to your draft. I'm grateful for the letter proposed and given the context of yesterdays meeting feel this meets the requirements of our response from DBT and OPSS, noting suggestions/comments from others.

Regards
(Redacted)

Item 2: Attachments found within email titled Chapple Response

Annex A – Extract of Personal Data for Subject Access Request [KIM 2024-25-37-CC]

(a)

From: [Redacted]

Sent on: Wednesday, August 7, 2024, 6:52 AM

Subject: Urgent Request for Public Inquiry into NAPIT and UKAS Practices

Dear (Redacted),

The following email below covers a request from Sparks Electrical Services for a public inquiry into NAPIT and UKAS practices. (Redacted)

(Redacted)

Please advise whether your team can respond to the enquiry as it leads on the relationship with UKAS and accreditation policy across government. NAPIT is a leading Government approved UKAS accredited membership scheme operator in the building services and fabric sector.

Many thanks

(Redacted)

Copy of an email you sent

From: Spark Electrical Services <sparkelectrical.sw@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, August 3, 2024 2:19 AM

Subject: Urgent Request for Public Inquiry into NAPIT and UKAS Practices

(b) Secretary of State

From: [Redacted]

To: [Redacted]

Sent on: Friday, August 9, 2024 6:03 PM

Subject: Secretary of State

Hi [Redacted],

Hope you are well. We have been asked to provide a response to a Secretary of State correspondence from Spark Electrical Services who have requested a Public Inquiry into NAPIT (the National Association of Professional Inspectors and Testers) and UKAS Practices.

The correspondent states that the dispute between Spark Electrical Services and NAPIT, led to a review by UKAS, which the correspondent believes has highlighted significant procedural and regulatory issues as well as a conflict of interest that appears to benefit both NAPIT and UKAS. A complaint was made by the correspondent to UKAS on 23/07/2024 which was followed up by a further complaint on 25/07/2024 regarding this conflict of interest – at the time of writing (03-08-2024), the correspondent has not received a response from UKAS.

The correspondent has stated:

Annex A – Extract of Personal Data for Subject Access Request [KIM 2024-25-37-CC]

- there is collusion between NAPIT and UKAS in reviewing complaints, failing to address key safety and procedural concerns;
- lack of transparency in UKAS's review which focused on procedural adherence rather than fairness and accuracy, failing to provide a thorough investigation;
- lack of response from UKAS to documentation sent to senior management at UKAS on LinkedIn, correlating UKAS's responses to the review of NAPIT with the correspondent's provided evidence submitted against ISO 17011, ISO 17065 standards, and IAF MD20 document.

As this complaint against UKAS has come as a Secretary of State correspondence, the turn around time to provide an initial response is short. Therefore please can we discuss this case with you as soon as possible to understand the complaints and respond initially with updated facts (eg. if UKAS has already responded or investigating the complaint etc).

Many thanks.

Kind regards

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]

To: [Redacted]

Sent on: Monday, August 12, 2024 3:50 PM

Subject: Secretary of State

Hi [Redacted],

I understand that [Redacted] is trying to arrange a meeting to discuss this matter.

As a quick heads-up, UKAS has been communicating with Mr Chapple since April over his concerns, and our investigation, plus follow up review, found that the CB concerned had not breached accreditation requirements. This has not been well received, and since then we are aware that Mr Chapple has been making baseless accusations regarding UKAS on social media. The letter to the SoS, which was also copied to UKAS, has brought this matter to your attention, but his accusations are generic and he has made no attempt to justify them.

Given that he is requesting a public inquiry, would DBT not first seek justification from him for the serious allegations he is making? We are obviously happy to work with you over this matter to bring it to a swift conclusion, but this is another case of someone simply objecting because they do not like the outcome of our investigation. We have already spent considerable time on this and it will be difficult to discuss if we are not aware of the exact points where Mr Chapple believes we have a case to answer. To be honest I am confident that he cannot provide any justification to support his allegation as we have acted appropriately, but I would expect the onus to be on him in the first instance to provide some evidence.

Kind regards,

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]

To: [Redacted]

Annex A – Extract of Personal Data for Subject Access Request [KIM 2024-25-37-CC]

Sent on: Monday, August 12, 2024 5:10 PM

Subject: Secretary of State

Hi [Redacted],

I think it would be important for OPSS to understand the background to this case so we can go back and ask for evidence of his concerns. One of his complaints is that he hasn't received any response from UKAS so we would need to address that too.

Thanks

[Redacted]

Item 3:

Subject: TOB2024/07947 - Urgent Request for Public Inquiry into NAPIT and UKAS Practices - Deadline: 11th September

Sent on: 02 September 2024 09:01

From:[Redacted]

To: [Redacted]

Sent on: 02 September 2024 09:01

Hi All,

Please the attached correspondence and the below for a TO case on "Request for public inquiry in NAPIT and UKAS Practices".

Grateful for a SCS cleared draft by COP Friday, 6th September from yourselves.

Thank you

Redacted

ATTACHMENT (A)

Annex A – Extract of Personal Data for Subject Access Request [KIM 2024-25-37-CC]



Department for
Business & Trade

Department for Business and Trade
Old Admiralty Building
Admiralty Place
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2DY

Conor Chapple

T +44 (0) 20 4551 0011
E enquiries@businessandtrade.gov.uk
W www.gov.uk

Ref: TOB2024/07947

By email: sparkedelectrical.sw@gmail.com

5th September 2024

5th September 2024

Dear Conor Chappel,

Thank you for your correspondence of 3rd August, addressed to the previous Secretary of State [The](#) Rt Hon Kemi Badenoch MP, regarding NAPIT and UKAS practices.

As you are aware, UKAS is the appointed National Accreditation Body for the UK. Their role is to provide accreditation to organisations and their remit is defined in the international standard for accreditation bodies ISO 17011. UKAS is independent of Government but operates under a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Department for Business and Trade via the Office for Product Safety and Standards (OPSS). The MoU establishes the way UKAS and Government will work together to maintain and promote a strong accreditation service in the UK.

We raised your case with UKAS regarding their activity in investigating NAPIT. UKAS have informed us that they have undertaken two separate internal investigations regarding your complaint and concluded that there were no significant non-conformities by NAPIT which would affect their accreditation status. As you have separately stated that you consider that there is a conflict of interest that appears to benefit both NAPIT and UKAS,

which would affect their accreditation status. As you have separately stated that you consider that there is a conflict of interest that appears to benefit both NAPIT and UKAS, please could you provide evidence of this for OPSS to investigate your complaint about UKAS' handling of the NAPIT investigation.

Kind regards,

Correspondence Unit

Department for Business and Trade

ATTACHMENT (B)

From: [Redacted]

To: [Redacted]

Subject

Sent on

Dear [Redacted]

,

The following email below covers a request from Sparks Electrical Services for a public inquiry into NAPIT and UKAS practices. It has been erroneously sent to the UK Defence and Security Exports enquiry mailbox and is also addressed to the previous Secretary of State at an old department address.

[Redacted] in Private Office has asked me to pass on to the relevant team for processing.

Please advise whether your team can respond to the enquiry as its leads on the relationship with UKAS and accreditation policy across government. NAPIT is a leading Government approved UKAS accredited membership scheme operator in the building services and fabric sector.

Many thanks, [Redacted]

From: [Redacted]

To: [Redacted]

Sent on: Mon 02/09/2024 15:55

Hi [Redacted],

Appreciate you are very busy but please can you have a look at the draft response to the Minister's Correspondence. [Redacted]

I had a meeting with [Redacted] and [Redacted] from UKAS a few weeks back. This case has been rumbling on since April this year – it arose as a customer of Mr Chappel refused to pay for electrical work in connection to him not issuing a certificate for the work. The customer complained to NAPIT which he was a member of. Mr Chappel has since withdrawn his membership as NAPIT did not find in his favour. He subsequently complained to UKAS about NAPIT. UKAS have undertaken 2 separate enquiries to address Mr Chappel's complaints about NAPIT but have not found anything substantial in NAPIT's handling of the customer complaint. Furthermore Mr Chappel has not provided evidence of his allegations on NAPIT to UKAS.

Annex A – Extract of Personal Data for Subject Access Request [KIM 2024-25-37-CC]

Mr Chappel has also made a formal complaint to the EA about UKAS which has not be upheld. EA concluded that the accredited body (NAPIT) continues to adhere to the accreditation requirements in this specific case and that UKAS's process was both thorough and objective, ensuring compliance with accreditation standards.

I don't think we should mention the EA's response (best to keep that for a further response if he comes back) and only ask for evidence of his allegations (he has not been able to provide it to UKAS previously).

Thanks
[Redacted]

Item 4:

Subject: Formal Complaint on Regulatory Handling Failures and Conflicts of Interest Involving OPSS|CRM:0315000000476

Sent on:

Copy of an email you sent

From: sparkelectrical.sw@gmail.com;

Received: Sun Aug 25 2024 03:47:00 GMT+0100 (British Summer Time)

Subject: Formal Report on NAPIT's Misuse of UKAS Accreditation and Conflict of Interest Impacting Certification Integrity

On 28 Aug 2024, at 12:56, OPSS Enquiries
<OPSS.enquiries@businessandtrade.gov.uk> wrote:

Hi Conor,

Thank you for contacting the Office for Product Safety and Standards (OPSS).

Our role at the Office for Product Safety and Standards is to provide support and advice to local authority trading standards teams and coordinating work across local authorities where action is needed on a national scale. The creation of the OPSS has not meant a change to the responsibilities of trading standards, who continue to play a vital role in working locally with businesses and responding to consumer complaints.

If you have questions about a business or believe they may not comply with UK Regulations, you should contact Trading Standards, who are responsible for enforcement of these businesses in the UK, via the Citizens' Advice Consumer Helpline. This is the network of call centres run by Citizens' Advice on behalf of Trading Standards to provide first line support and advice to consumers. An explanation of how it works is given on the [Citizens' Advice](#) web page and details on how you can contact them can be found [here](#).

If you are based in Northern Ireland, I would advise that you contact [Consumerline](#).

Annex A – Extract of Personal Data for Subject Access Request [KIM 2024-25-37-CC]

Regards,

Copy of an email you sent

From: Spark Electrical Services <sparkelectrical.sw@gmail.com>

Sent: 09 October 2024 16:53

Subject: Formal Complaint on Regulatory Handling Failures and Conflicts of Interest Involving OPSS|CRM:0315000000476

From:[Redacted]

Sent:

Hi [Redacted],

[Redacted] I suggest we keep our response on this one minimal. [Redacted] It should be noted that the enquirer has asked NAPIT, UKAS, EA and the Building Safety Regulator to investigate his claims and all have come back stating his complaints are not upheld, the case is closed and they will not be responding further.

[Redacted]

[Redacted] and [Redacted] I suggest we simply reply that there are governance procedure in place for UKAS by DBT and that there are no conflicts of interest that the enquirer has raised. The basis for the enquirer's complaints is related to a financial dispute with one of his customers and as he did not provide the customer with a certificate of work (a legal requirement), he escalated this dispute to NAPIT who could not help him as they don't deal with financial issues. This then started the complaints to the various organisations. [Redacted]

Thanks

[Redacted]

Item 5:

Subject: Secretary of State Correspondence

Sent on: 23 October 2024 17:09

Hi [Redacted]

Thanks for the update on the case. I'm aware [Redacted] undertook the 2nd review of Mr Chapple's complaint NAPIT and we have a copy of that. However I don't appear to have any information on the 1st review. Please could you let me know who conducted that and would it be possible to have a copy of it. Many thanks.

Thanks

[Redacted]

From: Redacted
Sent on: Thu 24/10/2024 19:39

Hi [Redacted],

There have been some further developments in this case which are probably best discussed over a Teams call. I am on leave tomorrow but happy to pick up with you next week. In the interim I have attached the first response we sent to Mr Chapple detailing our conclusions.

Kind regards
[Redacted]

Attachment Email

Subject: A000740850 Complaint regarding NAPIT
From: [Redacted]
To: sparkelectrical.sw@gmail.com

Dear Mr Chapple,

We have completed our investigation into the complaint which you raised with us in relation to NAPIT who are a UKAS accredited certification body.

UKAS' role in this case has been to investigate the actions of NAPIT (accreditation reference 6691) in terms of the requirements of accreditation as set out in the applicable international standard (in this case ISO/IEC 17065). UKAS is not a mediation or arbitration service, and we will not mediate in the event of a dispute or investigate matters that fall outside the scope of accreditation such as matters of contract.

UKAS (as confirmed in our acknowledgement dated 23.04.24) must comply with the international standard ISO/IEC 17011 and have a contractual agreement with each of its customers to maintain as confidential information we gain access to during the accreditation process. Our response in this case is therefore provided in accordance with this requirement.

The UKAS investigation considering the requirements of accreditation and specifically those detailed in ISO/IEC 17065, has included an assessment of NAPIT's actions, including records and procedures related to this case.

The information assessed demonstrated that NAPIT had followed process and their scheme rules giving your organisation the opportunity to provide evidence and take the necessary action (e.g. issue a minor work certificate) prior to the imposition of the suspension. It was also confirmed that you were advised that at the point of suspension there was the option to appeal the decision which we note you chose not to do, instead cancelling your membership. There is no evidence that NAPIT has acted contrary to the requirements of accreditation.

Given the above we are closing and that UKAS has found no evidence that NAPIT have failed to act in accordance with the accreditation requirements we will be marking this complaint as closed in our records.

Thank you for bringing your concerns to our attention.

Regards
[Redacted]

Item 6:

Subject: FOLLOW UP TO CASE TOB2024/07947 - Deadline: 4th October

Sent on: 23 October 2024 16:32

Hi [Redacted],
further to my previous email, I'm querying Mr Chapple's statement that a review by [Redacted] was sent to DBT. We don't appear to have a document authored by [Redacted] sent in by Mr Chapple. Please could you check that there are no other emails/documents from Mr Chapple that haven't been sent to me. Many thanks.

Thanks
[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thu 24/10/2024 10:57

Hi [Redacted],

I have attached all correspondence we have received from Mr Chapple so far (following our initial response). Apologies if you have received some of them already, as there are quite a few to keep track of.

Many thanks,
[Redacted]

Attachment (a)
Copy of an email you sent
Sent on: Tue 22/10/2024 13:36
Subject: Department for Business and Trade Response - TOB2024/08816

Attachment (b)
Copy of an email you sent
Sent on: Fri 11/10/2024 12:13
Subject: Intentional Concealment or Incompetence.

Attachment (c)
Copy of an email you sent
Sent on: Wed 09/10/2024 16:53
Subject: Formal Complaint on Regulatory Handling Failures and Conflicts of Interest Involving OPSS|CRM:0315000000476

Attachment (d)

Copy of an email you sent

Sent on: Wed 09/10/2024 09:01

Subject: Conflict Confirmation.

Attachment (e)

Copy of an email you sent

Sent on: Mon 07/10/2024 13:10

Subject: Urgent Review Needed: Conflicts of Interest within UKAS, Past Affiliations and Significant Overlaps. 80 Days Silence- TOB2024/08816

Title of PDF Attachments sent in by you found within this Attachment

- ESF Inaction pdf
- N24 Internal Review March 2024 pdf
- UKAS PHENNA pdf
- NAPIT COO pdf
- ESF Charity Commission; Confirmation of your Raising Concerns web forms submission nCRM0049925 pdf
- UKAS, BSI, Bureau, etc – Regulatory Capture pdf

Copy of an email you sent

Sent on: Tue 15/10/2024 14:03

Subject: Urgent Clarification Regarding BS 7671 Standard in NAPIT Accreditation Schedule

From [Redacted]

Sent on: Thu 24/10/2024 17:01

Subject: TOB2024/08816 - FOLLOW UP TO CASE TOB2024/07947 - Deadline: 4th October

Hi [Redacted],

To note we have not been provided any of the attachments in the email below except the one we received on 22nd October from DBT CU. I have reviewed all these additional documents sent now and none of them is evidence of conflict of interest or at all.

However I have not logged them on our spreadsheet yet or amended the paper for [Redacted] because they will not make a difference to our response to the complaint. I will in due course add them to the spreadsheet and include my assessment.

Amongst the emails in the collection sent by DBT Correspondence Unit, attached are those of interest. One (dated 7/10/2024) raises a conflict of interest with UKAS and BSI personnel including [Redacted] and [Redacted].

Also in this recent collection of emails sent by DBT CU is the complaint on OPSS Enquiries handling of Mr Chapple's original complaint to the Enquiries Team on conflict of interest between OPSS staff and UKAS. I will contact [Redacted] for a copy of the response that was sent back.

Thanks

Annex A – Extract of Personal Data for Subject Access Request [KIM 2024-25-37-CC]

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent on: Fri 06/09/2024 17:13
Subject: RE: Secretary of State

Hi [Redacted]

Further to the email below we are aware Mr Chapple is calling into question the impartiality of the EA and has raised several questions which they will not be addressing. I have however, agreed with [Redact] to draft a response as a means of addressing these final unsubstantiated claims and to reconfirm UKAS has closed the complaint and will not engage further. I will let you have a copy of the response once it has been sent should you need it.

Kind regards
[Redacted]

From:[Redacted]
Sent on: Tue 22/10/2024 15:55
Subject: Secretary of State

Hi [Redacted],
Hope you are well. We have been asked to provide a response to a Secretary of State correspondence from Spark Electrical Services who have requested a Public Inquiry into NAPIT (the National Association of Professional Inspectors and Testers) and UKAS Practices.

The correspondent states that the dispute between Spark Electrical Services and NAPIT, led to a review by UKAS, which the correspondent believes has highlighted significant procedural and regulatory issues as well as a conflict of interest that appears to benefit both NAPIT and UKAS. A complaint was made by the correspondent to UKAS on 23/07/2024 which was follow-up by a further complaint on 25/07/2024 regarding this conflict of interest – at the time of writing (03-08-2024), the correspondent has not received a response from UKAS.

The correspondent has stated:

- there is collusion between NAPIT and UKAS in reviewing complaints, failing to address key safety and procedural concerns;
- lack of transparency in UKAS's review which focused on procedural adherence rather than fairness and accuracy, failing to provide a thorough investigation;
- lack of response from UKAS to documentation sent to senior management at UKAS on LinkedIn, correlating UKAS's responses to the review of NAPIT with the correspondent's provided evidence submitted against ISO 17011, ISO 17065 standards, and IAF MD20 document.

As this complaint against UKAS has come as a Secretary of State correspondence, the turn around time to provide an initial response is short. Therefore please can we discuss this

Annex A – Extract of Personal Data for Subject Access Request [KIM 2024-25-37-CC]

case with you as soon as possible to understand the complaints and respond initially with updated facts (eg. if UKAS has already responded or investigating the complaint etc).
Many thanks.

Kind regards
[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent on: Tue 22/10/2024 15:55
Subject: RE: Secretary of State

Hi [Redacted],

Thank you for your email I have all the information on this case which I am happy to take you through. We have already addressed the complaint and conducted a further 2nd internal independent review because Mr Chapple alleged bias in our initial investigations.

I'll check diaries and send some dates over to arrange a call.

Kind regards
[Redacted]

From:[Redacted]
Sent on: Tue 22/10/2024 15:55
Subject: RE: Secretary of State

Hi [Redacted],
Thanks for our meeting about this case. I just wanted to check a couple of things with you for our reply to Mr Chappel.
He stated that he had not had any replies from sending documents through Linked In to senior management at UKAS – I understood that UKAS has since responded to this.
He has made allegation on collusion between NAPIT and UKAS and lack of transparency in UKAS's review – you have not received any evidence for this from him as requested.
Have you had any further communication from him?

Apologies for the short deadline but please can you get back to me asap as I need to submit this to the Minister's Office by Thursday. Many thanks.

Kind regards
[Redacted]

From:[Redacted]
Sent on: Tue 22/10/2024 15:55
Subject: RE: Secretary of State

Hi [Redacted],

Thank you for your email and request for further information in this case. I can respond to your points as follows:

Annex A – Extract of Personal Data for Subject Access Request [KIM 2024-25-37-CC]

Mr Chapple has been messaging UKAS personnel who are not be involved with his case via LinkedIn, and they have not responded as this is not the correct or specified communication route for his complaint (we have previously advised all communications need to be sent to customerfeedback@ukas.com). We did respond to his one request made via LinkedIn where he asked how to make a further complaint about my involvement in the management of his complaint as well as an allegation that the investigation was lacking in impartiality. We = undertook an independent review into these allegations and responded to his comments on 09.08.24 -.

I can confirm that Mr Chapple has made several allegations on social media regarding collusion but has not provided any evidence in support these claims. We believe his comments may be in reference to the LinkedIn profile of an external assessor (whose details he has not provided but we have since identified via our records) who works for Napit and who was briefly signed up with UKAS as a technical assessor but who has not completed any assessments or work on behalf of UKAS. He has never performed any assessment work for us. The lack of transparency is in reference to our confidentiality obligations which we clearly set out to him on receipt of his original complaint and which we have repeated to him in our subsequent communication including the letter attached to this email.

We have had no further direct communication from Mr Chapple other than the unsolicited and incorrect targeting of UKAS personnel via LinkedIn which have not been responded to.

Mr Chapple has subsequently made a complaint to the European Co-operation for Accreditation about the UKAS handling of his complaint. They have not upheld his complaint and I have attached a copy of their response to Mr Chapple for your reference. Mr Chapple has subsequently posted several negative and incorrect statements about EA on his LinkedIn page although we note as of today the page has been suspended.

I hope this information is of assistance, but should you require anything further please let me know.

Kind regards
[Redacted]

From: Redacted]
Sent on: 22/10/2024
Subject: RE: Secretary of State

Hi [Redacted],
Just following up on the case with Conor Chapple. I'm aware we don't have a document on the procedure for UKAS addressing complaints such as this one with Mr Chapple. Is there a document you could share with us just for our use so we are sighted on timelines for investigations and responding to complainants. Many thanks.

Kind regards
[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent on: 22/10/2024
Subject: RE: Secretary of State Correspondence

Annex A – Extract of Personal Data for Subject Access Request [KIM 2024-25-37-CC]

Hi [Redacted]

Thanks for your email.

The UKAS website details the complaint process and links to our Complaint Leaflet which sets out our role and remit. As per the attached leaflet we do make it clear that timescales can vary but we aim to investigate third party complaints in 90 working day of receipt, and we confirm timings in our acknowledgement which we did for Mr Chapple (copy attached for reference)

Complaints and Appeals – UKAS

UKAS-B22-03-2022-UKAS-Complaint-Letter.pdf

In this case we documented our conclusions on 22.07.24 which was within our stated timeframe and as communicated in our acknowledgement. He did not accept our response and that triggered to independent review.

Happy to discuss further if needed.

Kind regards

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]

Sent on: 22 October 2024 12:51

Subject: RE: Secretary of State Correspondence

Hi [Redacted],

Thanks very much for your quick response and the very helpful additional details on the case with Mr Chapple. We hope to complete this shortly. If there are any further developments, please let me know if appropriate for our purposes. Many thanks.

Kind regards

[Redacted]

From [Redacted]

Sent on: Tue 22/10/2024 15:55

Subject: RE: Secretary of State Correspondence

Hi [Redacted]

So, you are aware we have as of Friday notified Mr Chapple that he has been deemed a vexatious complainant and will not correspond further in any way with him and we have responded to his SAR.

Again if you need to confirm any details please give me a call.

Kind regards

[Redacted]

Item 7: Copy of Emails sent by you

Copy of an email you sent

From: Spark Electrical Services sparkedrical.sw@gmail.com **Subject:** Re: Our Client: NAPIT Certification Limited
Sent on: 1 September 2024 at 04:04
Subject: Urgent Inquiry Regarding NAPIT Accreditation Status and Certificate Validity

Copy of an email you sent

From: Spark Electrical Services sparkedrical.sw@gmail.com
Subject: I would address this first. Concerns Regarding BS 7671 Compliance and Certification Updates
Sent on: 12 August 2024 at 05:43

Copy of an email you sent

From: Spark Electrical Services sparkedrical.sw@gmail.com
Subject: Urgent Clarification Regarding BS 7671 Standard in NAPIT Accreditation Schedule
Sent on: 15 October 2024 at 14:04

Item 9: Emails

Subject: FW: UKAS NAPIT and EA to UKAS and NAPIT, Dare I ask? |Re: Department for Business and Trade Response - TOB2024/08816

Copy of an email you sent

From: Spark Electrical Services <sparkedrical.sw@gmail.com>
Sent: 30 October 2024 11:13
To: DBT Correspondence <DBTcorrespondence@businessandtrade.gov.uk>
Subject: UKAS NAPIT and EA to UKAS and NAPIT, Dare I ask? |Re: Department for Business and Trade Response - TOB2024/08816

From: [Redacted]
Sent on: 30 October 2024 11:54
Subject: FW: UKAS NAPIT and EA to UKAS and NAPIT, Dare I ask? |Re: Department for Business and Trade Response - TOB2024/08816

Hi [Redacted],

Is there anything we need to do with the below request from the correspondent?
Please see the attached response we issued and advice from officials below.

Please note: This correspondent has been classed vexatious complainant by UKAS and has been issued a 'cease and desist' letter by NAPIT's lawyers. Going forward it would be helpful if DBT correspondence unit can classify him as a persistent correspondent as the policy team have closed the case and do not intend to respond to any further queries.

Many thanks,
[Redacted]

From: [redacted]

Sent on: 30 October 2024 14:49

Dear [Redacted],

Please attached correspondence and the below message from policy leads on how we should proceed with this correspondent going forward. Mr Chapple is now classed as vexatious, with policy leads indicating they will take no additional actions. He is now requesting details on follow up procedures surrounding complaints.

Are you able to take forward as appropriate from your side please?

Many thanks
[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]

Sent: 31 October 2024 08:58

Morning,

[Redacted]

How I'm reading it is he is still wanting his initial complaint escalating rather than complaining on the handling by the correspondence team?

If complaining about how the correspondence team have handled this then yes, we can take forward, but if its about his initial complaint we would more than likely align with what has already been responded as it doesn't appear to be about a service that DBT have provided however I don't have his initial email.

Can you send me his initial complaint and any background please.

Many thanks,
[Redacted]

From : [Redacted]

Sent: 31 October 2024 10:43

Hi [Redacted],

Thanks for your message.

It's not clear the reasons why your team were not initially involved and if an error on our side, I regret and apologise for this. I believe that he is requesting that his initial complaint be escalated, rather than complaining on the case handling by the policy or correspondence teams.

[Redacted], could you share all relevant background information on this please?

Many thanks,

From [Redacted]

Sent: 31 October 2024 11:01

Hi [Redacted],

Please find attached the initial complaint he sent in alongside the emails that the correspondent sent in (FW: REF: TOB2024/07947). [Redacted]

OPSS was issuing a holding response early October (attached-TOB2024_08816) due to the sheer amount of information the correspondent was sending in and it was taking longer to work through it.

Attached (TOB2024_08816-30 Oct) is also the last correspondence OPSS drafted that we sent (to which he has sent this complaint in response).

I have attached the subsequent emails he has also sent in between the issuing of the two OPSS responses. Let me know if you have any further questions.

Many thanks,
[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]

Sent: 04 November 2024 11:05

Hi team,

We have received a complaint which was sent to the correspondence team.

We have 2 options here. As none of the correspondence has yet been considered under the departments complaints process, we could open a new complaint case and handle this as a new complaint. Or we could consider, that the correspondence received as been replied to in accordance with the complaints process, although it hasn't been formally recorded as a complaint under the central process, we can then respond to the e-mail of 23/10 as if it were a formal request for a review of the complaint.

Please can you confirm which route you would like us to take.

Many thanks,

[Redacted]

"Please note that the below information displayed in this email communication is incorrect. This Subject Access Request was sent to DBT DP team on 25 November. We are liaising with the team responsible for the delay to ensure that they forward such requests to us ASAP"

From: [Redacted]

Annex A – Extract of Personal Data for Subject Access Request [KIM 2024-25-37-CC]

Sent on: 01 November 2024 15:07

Hi [Redacted]

Bit of a complicated one, we have received the below.

I have put all the emails and a timeline into a folder

This never came to us in complaints and a response was issued by correspondence, the complainant is asking where this is at in the complaints process, although a response was sent.

Not sure if you want to pick this up as an internal review, if so we will log on eCase.

Policy teams within the department have now deemed the complainant as vexatious, however we know from past experience it isn't that easy. He does appear to have asked for the complaints process however I can't see that this was responded to.

The complainant also has an active SAR which is with the DP.

Please do let me know if there is anything you want me to do on this.

Many thanks,

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]

Sent on: Mon 04/11/2024 10:57

Hi [Redacted]

Re. this one. I think that we have 2 options here. As none of the correspondence has yet been considered under the departments complaints process, we could open a new complaint case and handle this as a new complaint. Or we could consider, that the correspondence received as been replied to in accordance with the complaints process, although it hasn't been formally recorded as a complaint under the central process, and then we can respond to the e-mail of 23/10 as if it were a formal request for a review of the complaint.

If you can go back to [Redacted] and ask for their preference on this? My suggestion would be to go for the first option, and ask that they draft a formal response under the complaints process, we can then review and issue this centrally. We can then offer the complainant the opportunity for an independent review.

Regards

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]

Sent: 04 November 2024 11:46

Hi [Redacted],

Annex A – Extract of Personal Data for Subject Access Request [KIM 2024-25-37-CC]

Mr Chappell has now gone down the DBT complaints route. Below is the SP folder with all his correspondence that has been received and our latest letter to him. In my last email to the correspondence team. I did put down that the writer had been classed as a vexatious complainant by UKAS and had been issued a 'cease and desist' letter by NAPIT's lawyers.

The complaints team have given two options, see email below:

Can I leave it to you to respond to [Redacted] on this please as I think she has been assigned to deal with the case.

Many thanks

From: [Redacted]

Sent: 04 November 2024 18:50

Hi [Redacted]

I'm contacting you regarding handling TOB2024/08816 and its predecessor TOB2024/07947 which was a complaint about UKAS. For background this correspondence was addressed to [Redacted] in August 2024 and went round several teams before it was decided it should be handled by m team as Treat as Official Business as we oversee the relationship with UKAS.

We have reviewed all the documents provided to us and concluded that there is no evidence for the various complaints that were being made. Looking at the latest response from the correspondent, my understanding is that he wishes to escalate this above the department as he is asking if this is the final stage of the complaints procedure in DBT. I understand that the correspondence has not followed the complaints procedure but the outcome of the review of the information would not change regardless of the procedure used.

The correspondent has also complained about how OPSS Enquiries has responded to his enquiry regarding conflict of interest in UKAS and OPSS. This was sent separately to the DBT correspondence. Given there are a number of teams involved in this case which is not straightforward, I think it may be useful to discuss between us how we address the next steps. I'll send out a meeting invitation which I hope will be suitable to all on this email.

Thanks

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]

Sent: 05 November 2024 13:40

Hi all,

Please see draft response from complaints, please do amend as needed

Once all in agreement please can you send me your SCS clearances.

Many thanks,

Copy of the Draft Letter



Department for Business & Trade

Department for Business and Trade

Old Admiralty Building

London

SW1A 2DY

Conor Chapple

sparkelectrical.sw@gmail.com

T +44 (0)20 7215 5000

E Complaints@businessandtrade.gov.uk

W www.gov.uk/dit

CMPT12024/10570

:

12th November 2024

Dear Conor Chapple,

Thank you for your email of 30th October where you raised the following complaint:

I would also like to clarify whether this is the final stage of the formal complaint process with DBT. If so, please confirm so that I can escalate my concerns to the appropriate oversight bodies that scrutinise regulatory and public service bodies, such as the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman (PHSO) or other relevant authorities responsible for ensuring proper handling of complaints.

We can confirm that we have reviewed the emails in relation to UKAS and OPSS. The complaints process can only be used in relation to a service provided by the Department of Business and Trade (DBT) and our staff. UKAS operates independently of the Department for Business and Trade and the Government.

Consequently, we are unable to provide guidance on their complaints process and procedures as this is handled independently. We recommend that you follow any advice from UKAS to appeal their decisions.

On 30th October 2024, the correspondence team informed you that the relevant team within the Department (OPSS) had completed a review of your concerns and reached a conclusion on your case.

I am satisfied with the responses provided to you as your concerns do not relate to a service provided by the Department, which includes the Office for Product Safety and Standards.

If you are still not satisfied, you can ask your local MP to refer the matters that you have raised to the Ombudsman Services.

You can get more advice from the ombudsman's office by contacting:

Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman
Milbank Tower
30 Milbank
London
SW1P 4QP
Telephone: 0345 015 4033
Fax: 0300 061 4000

See:- <https://www.ombudsman.org.uk/>

Kind regards,

Complaints

Department for Business and Trade | Old Admiralty Building | London | SW1A 2DY
[E-mail:complaints@businessandtrade.gov.uk](mailto:complaints@businessandtrade.gov.uk)

From: [Redacted]

Sent on: Mon 04/11/2024 14:04

Hi [Redacted]

We are being asked on how we should progress the latest correspondence from Conor Chapple (his email is at the bottom of this chain). Although there is a different system for logging complaints to the department, I think we have dealt this as a complaint against UKAS which is why it came to our team. My preference as to which option we should take is that the correspondence has been dealt as a complaint and therefore we respond on that basis which will mean there is a review of the complaint. Should be discuss with [Redacted] and shall I set up a meeting?

Thanks
[Redacted]

Item 10

Analysis Of Documents Submitted In Minister's Correspondence
TOB2024/08816

Issue

This paper provides the background, assessment of documents received and handling of a complaint on NAPIT (National Association of Professional Inspectors and Testers), and UKAS (United Kingdom Accreditation Service)

practices from a Minister's Correspondence. A cleared response is required by 29th October 2024 to DBT Correspondence Unit (DBT CU) based on the assessment of documents received.

Case Review

Assessment of the documents showed no evidence to support the concerns of the correspondent or a conflict of interest between NAPIT and UKAS.

Furthermore, investigations carried out by the European cooperation for Accreditation (EA) and the Building Safety Regulator (BSR) on UKAS's review of NAPIT's handling of this case also concluded that the complainant's concerns could not be upheld. Both BSR and EA concluded that UKAS's handling was thorough and in accordance with the standard for accreditation bodies ISO 17011.

Recommendation

On the basis of the conclusion of the case review undertaken by Accreditation Team, it is recommended that the complaint on UKAS and NAPIT practices is not upheld. Therefore the response to the Minister's Correspondence should be drafted accordingly.

Summary of the case

The Accreditation Team received a Minister's Correspondence TOB (Treat as Official Business) on 2nd September 2024 for a 'Request for public inquiry in NAPIT and UKAS Practices'.

The correspondent (referred to as CC) wanted to bring DBT's attention to his belief of a series of critical issues concerning UKAS and NAPIT who are UKAS accredited. CC had issues of concern which reflect:

- deeper problems within the governance, transparency, and accountability frameworks of these organisations,
- handling of conflicts of interest,
- accreditation discrepancies,
- the above leading to public safety matters.

The Minister's Correspondence from CC is a culmination of events and escalation of his case to various organisations. CC is a NAPIT certified electrician and whose customer raised a complaint to NAPIT about a non-issue of a certificate for work carried out. CC was suspended by NAPIT after negotiations for a resolution failed. CC raised a complaint within NAPIT of the suspension and handling of the case. CC then raised a complaint on NAPIT to UKAS, as one of its accredited organisations.

UKAS undertook 2 reviews of NAPIT's handling of the case. Although there were some minor mishandling issues by NAPIT, these were not related to their accreditation requirements and UKAS did not uphold CC's complaint. CC escalated his complaint to EA regarding UKAS's review of NAPIT and conflict of interest with NAPIT and UKAS personnel in the case. EA's review of UKAS's

handling of CC's case and their accreditation of NAPIT concluded UKAS's actions were thorough and objective, ensuring compliance with accreditation standards. EA did not uphold CC's complaint and closed the case.

CC's correspondence with DBT, informed that CC had also submitted a complaint on NAPIT and UKAS to the Building Safety Regulator. After consulting with their Technical Policy Division, BSR confirmed that UKAS had investigated the matter through their complaint process and there was no evidence of NAPIT not meeting their accreditation requirements.

Accreditation Team (AT) Review:

AT analysed 272 documents sent in by CC as well as the email chain between CC and DBT CU. The detailed background to this case and analysis of documents are provided in Annexes 1 and 2.

The analyses and assessment of the documents did not provide evidence of the concerns raised by CC.

Conclusion

10) The documents reviewed do not support CC's complaint on conflict of interest with personnel at NAPIT and UKAS. There was no evidence of problems within the governance, transparency, and accountability within NAPIT or UKAS.

11) There was no evidence to support CC's claims of UKAS's accreditation discrepancies. This was supported by EA's review of UKAS's handling of NAPIT's review which EA concluded was thorough and objective, ensuring compliance with accreditation standards. EA concluded CC's complaint against UKAS could not be upheld and therefore closed the complaint.

12) BSR concluded that NAPIT and UKAS had acted in accordance with their requirements as a conformity assessment and accreditation body respectively.

13) On the above basis, it is recommended that CC's complaints in the Minister's Correspondence are not upheld and a response is drafted accordingly.

[Redacted]
22-10-2024

Item 11

Timeline

03/10/24 TOB2024/08816 holding response

07/10/24 13:10 Email from SES to Correspondence, highlighted some concerns regarding conflict of interests

09/10/24 09:01 Email from SES to UKAS, Correspondence Cc'd. SAR request to UKAS

Annex A – Extract of Personal Data for Subject Access Request [KIM 2024-25-37-CC]

09/10/24 16:53 Email from SES to OPSS, Correspondence Cc'd complaint to address significant regulatory handling failures and conflicts of interest within the Office for Product Safety and Standards (OPSS), the United Kingdom Accreditation Service (UKAS) not sent to complaints
11/10/24 12:13 Email from SES to UKAS, Correspondence Cc'd. General complaint
15/10/24 14:03 Email from SES to UKAS, Correspondence Cc'd. Complaint on inconsistency in the accreditation schedules
15/10/24 14:04 Email from SES to UKAS, Correspondence Cc'd. Complaint on inconsistency in the accreditation schedules
15/10/24 15:19 Asked for complaints policy
15/10/24 17:36 Email from Correspondence to [Redacted]. Seeking advice on next steps
22/10/24 13:36 Email from SES to Correspondence. Email complaining about UKAS's handling of complaint
23/10/24 16:29 Email from SES to OPSS, Correspondence Cc'd complaining about OPSS
30/10/24 Email from Correspondence TOB2024/08816 – no grounds for complaint
01/11/24 Email from SES to Correspondence regarding fraud within UKAS and EA

Item 12

Copy of an email you sent

Subject: Joint Complaint to EA, DBT, and UKAS Regarding EA MLA Status and Oversight Failures Due to Systemic Conflicts of Interest and Fraudulent Actions

Sent on: Fri 01/11/2024 19:49

Copy of an email you sent

Subject: REF: TOB2024/07947

Sent on: 15 October 2024 15:19

From: [Redacted]

Sent on: Tue 15/10/2024 17:36

Subject: REF: TOB2024/07947

Hi [Redacted]

Forwarding this complaint on to you to action, as not sure of the steps. Attaching the emails the correspondent has sent in (directed to others with DBT cc'd in) that we have not yet responded to and also the response they already received from us. We sent a holding reply on 4 October as the amount of information the correspondent is sending in is taking policy officials longer to go through. The full response draft is due back to us on 29 Oct.

Many thanks,
[Redacted]

Item 13

DBT Reply

Annex A – Extract of Personal Data for Subject Access Request [KIM 2024-25-37-CC]



Department for Business and Trade
Old Admiralty Building
Admiralty Place
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2DY

Conor Chapple

T +44 (0) 20 4551 0011
E enquiries@businessandtrade.gov.uk
W www.gov.uk

By email: sparkedelectrical.sw@gmail.com

Ref: TOB2024/08816

30 October 2024

Dear Conor Chapple,

Further to your correspondence of 8th September and the documents provided on your complaints on NAPIT and UKAS practices, the relevant team in the department have completed the review of these documents and concluded on your case.

completed the review of these documents and concluded on your case.

The Department has concluded that there is no evidence to support your concerns and issues regarding UKAS, NAPIT and their handling of your case. Therefore, your complaints are not upheld and your case is closed.

Regarding the separate correspondence with OPSS and the response of 23rd October 2024, the relevant team will respond in due course.

Kind regards,

Correspondence Unit
Department for Business and Trade

Item 14

From: [Redacted]

Sent on: 11 November 2024 11:41

Subject: RE: UKAS NAPIT and EA to UKAS and NAPIT, Dare I ask? | Re: Department for Business and Trade Response - TOB2024/08816

Annex A – Extract of Personal Data for Subject Access Request [KIM 2024-25-37-CC]

Hi [Redacted]

I have spoken with all team involved and have highlight to them that we cannot class this individual as vexatious or burdensome.

All were in agreement that this should be handled more as an internal review, the policy teams have drafted some lines which have been approved by all corresponding SCSs -

The complaints in relation to UKAS we have agreed we cannot comment on as this is handled independently by them.

The complaints in relation to OPSS the correspondence team handled and responded that there were no grounds for the complaint.

Background to the case that I was given is that the complainant completed work for a customer but refused to provide her with a safety certificate, he has voiced his frustrations with this and has made several complaints to several departments.

If you wish to reach out to the teams my contacts are

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Many thanks

[Redacted]

Item 15

Copy of an email you sent

Sent on: Tue 12/11/2024 16:46

Subject: Re: DBT Complaint Response- ref CMPT22024/10570

Copy of an email you sent

Sent on: 20 September 2024 05:53

Subject: Criminal Fraud Allegations Against NAPIT Re: Department for Business and Trade Response - TOB2024/07947

4 Screenshot attachment in the email.

IMG_9867.png

IMG_9840.png

IMG_9839.jpeg

IMG_9814.jpeg

Copy of an email you sent

Sent on: 08 September 2024 16:19

Subject: Re: Department for Business and Trade Response - TOB2024/07947

5 attachment found in this email.

1 Urgent Response Required

2 Re: UKAS A000740850 Complaint
3 Re: UKAS A000740850 Complaint
4 EA-1/17 S3 A: 2022
5 _Automatic reply: Urgent Response Required

Copy of an email you sent:

Sent on: 08 September 2024 09:12

Subject: Re: Department for Business and Trade Response - TOB2024/07947

Attachment found, titled, Main Report Zip.

SRA folder Contains below

- Chapple Cease and Desist 2-1
- Chapple Final Communication 2nd
- Final Offer Letter
- Formal Complaint Against Spencer West

Napit Capacity (is) Limited

(Accreditation Reference 6691)

A Lords Influence

Accreditation Discrepancy Ref

Conflicts, Communication Failures and Governance Breaches

Legal Threats, Social Media Blocking

My Review of The Conflicts Internal

Napit Capacity (is) Limited

Napit Certification (is) Limited

Napit Certification is Limited 2

Not Accredited Professional Inspector

Potential Slapp Action; My Review

Report on UKAS-NAPIT, UKAS-EA Conflicts, Communication Failures, and

Governance Breaches

The 4 Napit Reviews – Review

The Lords Influence

Who Was Aware – The Independent

Why This Matters Or Does It

YouOCove Been Blocked! By UKAS
